



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,397	12/21/2001	Patrick Zuili	2222.5600000	3617
26111 7590 08/07/2009 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/028,397

Applicant(s)

ZULI, PATRICK

Examiner

MICHAEL PYZOSHA

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40-46 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/15/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 16, 20-22 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adobe Acrobat 5.0 released 12 March 2001 as evidenced by "Adobe Acrobat 5.0 User's Guide for Chambers" in view of Kobata et al. (US 20020077985) in view of Yasuda (US 20020052981) and further in view of Graham et al. (US 20020178271).

As per claims 1, 16, and 40, Adobe discloses the functionality for a method for restricting use of a clipboard application by a method, the method comprising: receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by

a first source application (see page 17 where Acrobat is the first application); b) determining whether the source file is a secured file (see page 28, where requiring a password to access a document makes it secure and the determining step must be performed in order to know whether to ask for a password), where the secured file cannot be accessed without a priori knowledge (see pages 28 and 29 where the password is required to access the file); c) preventing copying of content (see pages 28 and 29 where the check box for "No Content Copying or Extraction, Disable Accessibility" prevents the copying); Adobe further discloses the ability for copying from Acrobat and pasting to a second destination application (see pages 17 and 18 where WordPerfect is the destination application).

Adobe fails to explicitly disclose preventing subsequent usage of the designated content in a second destination application via the clipboard application when the determining determines that the source file is a secured file and storing the designated content to the clipboard application prior to determining whether the designated content can be used and requiring a file key obtained by an authenticated user to access the protected file.

However, Kobata et al. teaches preventing cut/paste (i.e. clipboard) operations from being used to copy a protected document into another application (see paragraph [0222]), Yasuda teaches receiving a copy command, storing the designated content and then determining whether the content can be used (see FIG. 9 and paragraphs [0134]-[0141]) and Graham et al. teaches requiring a file (decryption) key obtained by an authenticated use to access a file (see paragraph [0066]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Kobata et al. method of preventing clipboard operations for secure documents to prevent copying from a secured PDF to an unsecured Word perfect document and to receiving a copy command, storing the designated content and
5 then determining whether the content can be used and to require a user to be authenticated to obtain a key to gain access.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for carefully controlled and managed distribution of digital content (see Kobata et al. paragraph [0222]), to allow a system manager to decide when content can be copied or not copied (see Yasuda
10 paragraph [0130]) and to protect files obtained via a network (see Graham et al. paragraphs [0065] and [0066]).

As per claims 2-4, modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system discloses receiving a copy and paste selection to provide the designated content to the destination application (see Adobe pages 17 and 18, numerals 1-6).

15 As per claims 5-6 and 21-22, modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system discloses said determining operates to determine that the source file is a secured file based on security information provided by the source application (see Adobe pages 28-30).

20 As per claim 20, modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system discloses permitting storage of the designated content to the clipboard application when the determining determines that the source file is not a secured file (see Adobe pages 17 and 18).

As per claims 41-43 the modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system discloses clearing the content of the clipboard (see Yasuda paragraphs [0134]-[0141]) and storing the designated content to the clipboard application when said determining determines that the source file is not a secured file (see Adobe pages 17 and 18) and providing either the blank content or the designated content based on the files security (see Yasuda paragraphs [0134]-[0141] and Adobe pages 17 and 18).

5 Claims 10-12 and 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Blank et al. (US 20030037253).

10 As per claims 10, 17, and 18, modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system discloses clearing the content of the clipboard (see Yasuda FIG. 9 and paragraphs [0134]-[0141]) but fails to explicitly disclose storing alternate content to the clipboard application in place of the designated content when said determining determines that the source file is a secured file.

15 However, Blank et al. teaches replacing information on a clipboard with alternative predetermined content when the file is a secure file (see paragraphs [0046] and [0032]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store alternate content in the clipboard when the source file is the secure file of the modified Adobe, Kobata et al. and Yasuda system.

20 Motivation to do so would have been control the degree of access the public has to data (see paragraph [0007]).

As per claims 11-12 and 19, the modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda, Graham et al. and Blank et al. system discloses storing the designated content to the clipboard application when said determining determines that the source file is not a secured file (see Adobe pages 17 and 18).

- 5 6. Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rubin et al. (US 7281272).

As per claim 44, modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda and Graham et al. system discloses clearing the content of the clipboard (see Yasuda FIG. 9 and
10 paragraphs [0134]-[0141]) but fails to explicitly disclose storing scrambled content to the clipboard application in place of the designated content when said determining determines that the source file is a secured file.

However, Rubin et al. teaches replacing information on a clipboard with scrambled predetermined content when the file is a secure file (see column 9 lines 6-
15 12).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store scrambled content in the clipboard when the source file is the secure file of the modified Adobe, Kobata et al. and Yasuda system.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent the original data to be displayed
20 (see Rubin et al. column 9 lines 6-12).

As per claims 45 and 46, the modified Adobe, Kobata et al., Yasuda, Graham et al. and Rubin et al. system discloses storing the designated content to the clipboard

application when said determining determines that the source file is not a secured file (see Adobe pages 17 and 18) and providing either the scrambled content or the designated content based on the files security (see Rubin et al. column 9 lines 6-12 Yasuda paragraphs [0134]-[0141] and Adobe pages 17 and 18).

5

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 16, 20-22 and 40-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 07/15/2009 have been fully considered but they are
10 not persuasive. With respect to Applicant's argument (see pages 13-14) that Yasuda fails to teach receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application and storing the designated content to the clipboard application, Yasuda teaches a user conducting a copy operation for copying data on the display unit of the user terminal (see paragraph [0134]).

15 Furthermore, this copy operation is conducted on an application (see paragraph [0016]); in other words the user is copying data (i.e. a source file) within an application that is displayed by the application onto the display unit of the user terminal. Furthermore, Acrobat teaches receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application (see page 17 where Acrobat is
20 the first application). Continuing, Yasuda teaches storing selected data to the clipboard (see paragraphs [0137] and [0138] where the data is transferred and in order to later paste this data as in paragraph [0141] or to clear the data as in paragraph [0140] the

data must be stored). Applicant also contends that the data cannot be stored because the controlling of copying of data is done by clearing content of the clipboard, however, as described in paragraphs [0137]-[0140] the data is first transferred to the clipboard and then it is determined whether to control the copying of this data, and when it is
5 controlled the clipboard is cleared otherwise the content remains in the clipboard. Therefore, the modified Adobe, Kobata and Yasuda system discloses receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application and storing the designated content to the clipboard application

10

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOSKA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

15

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

5 For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10 /Michael Pyzocha/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437